DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 218 TM 035 323

AUTHOR	Husu, Jukka
TITLE	What a Difference a Discipline Approach Makes? Constructing Performing Quality in Teacher-Student Relations.
PUB DATE	2003-08-00
NOTE	23p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (10th, Padua, Italy, August 26-30, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; Foreign Countries; Profiles; Research Methodology; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Methods; Values
IDENTIFIERS	Finland

ABSTRACT

This study investigated and evaluated how and under what theoretical and practical conditions different pedagogical practices can succeed in real world school settings between teachers and students. The preliminary data included 36 primary school teachers from urban public schools in Helsinki, Finland. The study used two complementary methods: teachers' performing portraits and performing case reports. Both were based on classroom observations, teacher interviews, and teachers' interpretive comments. For picturing pedagogical encounters, the paper introduces a relational teacher-student behavior continuum. The results present conceptual tools to look at teachers' professional practices in schools and the dependence of the respective student behaviors in the same situations. It is hoped that teachers can take advantage of them in order to examine different approaches in different situations and to find which approach best fits their own and their students' value systems. (Contains 2 figures and 51 references.) (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Husu

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 481 218

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A DISCIPLINE APPROACH MAKES?

CONSTRUCTING PERFORMING QUALITY IN TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONS

Jukka Husu
Academy of Finland/ Department of Teacher Education
Centre for Research on Teaching (CRT)
Siltavuorenpenger 20 O
P. O. Box 9
00014 University of Helsinki
Finland

jukka.husu@helsinki.fi

TM035323

Paper presented at the 10th Biennial Conference of the
European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI)
August 26–30, 2003
Padova, Italy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A DISCIPLINE APPROACH MAKES?
Constructing performing quality in teacher-student relations

Jukka Husu
University of Helsinki

ABSTRACT This paper aims to investigate and evaluate how – and under what theoretical and practical conditions - different pedagogical practices can succeed in real world school settings between teachers and students. The preliminary data includes 36 primary school teachers from urban public schools, Helsinki, Finland. The study uses two complementary methods: 1) teachers' performing portraits, and 2) performing case reports. Both are based on classroom observations, teacher interviews, and teachers' interpretative comments. For picturing pedagogical encounters, the paper introduces a relational teacher-student behavior continuum. The results present conceptual tools to look at teachers' professional practices in schools – and their dependence of the respective student behaviors in the same situations. It is hoped that teachers can take advantage of them in order to examine different approaches in different situations and to find which approach best fit their own and their students' value systems.

INTRODUCTION

Classroom management and student discipline are the most common concern cited by most teachers as well as being the focus of media reports, and school staff room conversations (McCormack, 1997; Cothran *et al.*, 2003; Wolfgang *et al.*, 1999; Wolfgang, 2001). For teachers, it does not take long of a new school year to find out that some students are going to challenge their skills as a teacher and disciplinarian. They may have students that engage in a host of misbehaviors that require them to deal with those students repeatedly, sapping their energy. As Wolfgang (2001, iii) puts it, those students set 'fires' that teachers are forced to put out, or they take up too much of their teaching time and ruin the pacing and continuity of the school day.

Important, the issues of classroom management and student discipline are necessary conditions for safe and functional class - and for purposeful teaching. They are the prerequisites that allow teachers' do their teaching and enables student's studying/learning to be successful (Kansanen *et al.*, 2000). Student misbehavior can disrupt other students in the class, as well as the teacher, from a learning focus. Cotton (1990) reports that even one half of the all classroom time is taken up with activities other than instruction, and discipline problems are responsible for significant portion of this lost instructional time. Also, it may contribute to teacher dissatisfaction and burnout (Borg & Riding, 1991).

Everyone from politicians to professors, from parents to school administrators has a view on discipline, as have teachers themselves, too. These views are often expressed with great force. Some regard student indiscipline as a welcomed cry of protest against a school environment that is unfriendly and is not founded on true relationships and communication between teachers and students but on rules and stereotypes. Accordingly, they advocate radical revision of everyday school practices (e.g. Koutselini, 2002). Others view student discipline in a more positive light. They see discipline as a means to achieve other important goals in education. They stick with more conservative positions where the teacher defines and decides what behavior is wanted and assertively takes actions to get more positive student behavior (e.g. Jones, 1987, 2000; Alberto & Troutman, 1990).

The issues of discipline and classroom management are very much politically loaded, too. In public, these different models seem to swing much like a pendulum over time from behaviorist positions (e.g. high stakes student grading in all areas) to more humanistic practices (e.g. constructivist learning, and the teaching of social problem solving). These views can be regarded as complementary source of information. However, they should not constitute a definite statement of the pedagogical relations between teachers and students taking place in schools.

This study is preliminary part of a larger study investigating teacher-student behaviour and interactions in discipline and classroom management problems. Generally, this research project aims to investigate and evaluate how – and under what theoretical and practical conditions - different pedagogical practices can succeed in real world school settings between teachers and students. The specific research questions that guided this portion of the study can be stated as follows: i) How teachers described themselves as disciplinarians in the problems of classroom management; and ii) what kind of discipline and classroom management strategies do teachers prefer in problem situations?

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Discipline and pedagogical practice as an interpretation

Before going into description of theoretical issues, a clarification of what is meant by 'practical' is helpful. This is because the concept is little understood (van Manen, 1977; Reid 1999; Waks, 2000), despite the fact that we tend to think that what teachers simply do is practical. However, by using Schwab's (1969, 1971) idea of the practical, the concept includes more than meets the eye. According to the 'Schwabian' tradition and perspective, practice depends mainly on tradition and character. Therefore,

discussions of the improvement of practice need primarily to be discussions of how tradition is to be shaped and how character is to be formed. This is because the ability to exercise deliberation depends on the traits of character.

In addition, we tend to see practical as value-free, the idea that teaching consists simply of discovering 'what works.' In this view, what teachers do (i.e. their practices) is simply a matter of technical know-how. According to this short-sighted stance, there are various means of achieving certain ends - e.g. making teaching more caring - and the choice between them is just a matter of which methods are most effective in producing the desired results. But if tradition and character are considered as important factors in achieving caring relations between teachers and students, then we have to accept the notion that tradition and character are more than the product of experiences of what works. Practical supports and sympathizes with "certain kinds of actions on the basis of what communities and individuals value" (Reid, 1999, p. 13). Therefore, notions of practical are deeply influenced by social and cultural considerations. This, in turn, implies that as we confront practical problems, we also face with problems of moral choice.

Teachers and students are not free to do whatever they want; there are certain responsibilities and duties that come along with the educational context. Teachers' work is carried out within schools, and with these institutions come certain aims and goals to direct the process. The term 'pedagogical' refers to this bounded system, and it is accompanied with certain values. Teachers and students are expected to act according with these values.

Pedagogical also means taking stands. In educational contexts acting means making decisions continuously, and it also means choosing between competing alternatives in order to arrive at a certain result. Educational decisions need also some criteria. However, it is important to note that not all criteria can be stated explicitly. In fact, the pervasiveness of pedagogical situations (Husu, 2002a) implies that a great deal of teaching depends on teachers' personal presence and their perceptiveness of what to do in various contingent situations. Broadly speaking, the 'pedagogical' is their answer(s) to the question of 'How should teachers live and act in their work?'

Theoretical premises

In the last decade, a growing number of educational scholars have shifted their attention away from the individual teacher perspective and have begun to explore educational processes as socially negotiated (Britzman, 1991; Freeman, 1996; Wortham, 2001; Miller Marsh, 2002; Husu, 2002a). From this perspective, teachers' work can be defined as a relational phenomenon that is continually being constituted and reconstituted as

teachers move in and out of particular set of relations. This perspective provides teachers with multiple ways to position themselves in relations to students, actions, and ideas within school settings.

This study treats teachers' pedagogical knowledge as a broad theoretical concept and as an extended practice (Husu, 2002a). Pedagogical activity is not simply what happens in schools and classrooms, it can also be found 'inside' teachers and 'outside' institutions. Many of these personal features and cultural aspects collapse into one another in teachers' pedagogical knowledge. This is because teachers are personally involved in their actions and reflections and combine intellectual skills, virtues, habits of mind, appropriate social behavior etc. Usually, teachers are so involved in their activities that they cannot experience themselves as separate from those activities. According to Roth *et al.* (2001), they relate to their work in such a manner that there is no longer a teacher that experiences her-/himself "in an objectified world - there is only enacting performance that constitutes an event" (p. 185).

In addition, it is found important to treat a wide array of issues that are, at least in part, ethical in nature (Sockett, 1993; Husu, 2001, 2003; Husu & Tirri, 2001, 2003). Most actions teachers take in schools and classrooms contain some moral meaning that, in turn, influence others. Frequently, it is a question of familiar, routine aspects of the teacher's work that are conveying moral meanings. This can also happen without the teacher being aware of it. Here, the circularity between the teacher's actions and her/his character is evident (Sherman, 1989). Therefore, within the issues of classroom management and discipline, it is not just a question of a cognitive capacity that a teacher has at her/his disposal. Rather, teacher actions are closely bound up with the kind of person that a teacher is. A teacher's actions – and her/his possibilities – can only be found within particular situations, informed by her/his particular histories and school institutions. The actions of a teacher are made strong by repeated encounters with those actions. Consequently, a teacher sees them not only as a way of behaving in particular contexts, but also as her/his 'way of being' that arises in those situations (cf. Dunne, 1993).

Sockett (1993) has examined *the moral base of teaching profession*, in which the concept of professionalism describes the quality of practice. It portrays a teacher's manner of conduct within her/his occupation, how s/he integrates her/his obligations with her/his ethical relations with her/his students. Teaching is seen as an interpersonal activity directed at shaping and influencing students by means of a teacher's pedagogical skills. A teacher is a person who helps to shape what a student becomes. Therefore, the moral good of every student is of fundamental importance in every teaching situation. The character and the commitment are integral parts of teacher

professionalism. As a result, Sockett (1993) argues, it is "impossible to talk extensively about teachers and teaching without a language of morality" (p. 13).

Based on these ideas, this study advances two theoretical approaches to uncover teachers' pedagogical reasoning in the issues of classroom management and discipline:

i) *Teacher knowledge as identity rationality* When teachers undertake teaching they analyze i) their situation - what is possible; ii) their students - what their students need and what they can do; and iii) themselves as teachers - what kinds of teachers they are themselves (cf. Fuller & Brown, 1975; Convay & Clark, 2003). When teachers act and interact in a given context, they recognize themselves (and others recognize them) as acting as a certain 'kind of person' or even as different 'kinds' at once. Multiple identities are connected not [only] to teachers' internal states but also to their performances in schools and classrooms. Consequently, the research task is to investigate teachers' pedagogical knowledge from the viewpoint of their identity rationality.

ii) *The negotiative dimension of teaching* Within this stance, teachers' pedagogical knowledge resides in relations as they encounter with others. Negotiative processes characterize these relations and reflect the situational nature of (mainly) teacher-student relationships. Here, negotiating means conferring with the other(s) so as to arrive at the settlement of some (often conflicting) matter (Husu, 2002b). The attention is shifted to relationships which enable educators to learn about themselves as they learn with others (Gallego *et al.*, 2001). These negotiations take place in the context of larger political, historical and structural contexts of the pedagogical situation. This wider socio-cultural system must be taken into account in order to understand the negotiative dimensions of pedagogical problems. Consequently, the research task is to understand and explicate more deeply the complexity of pedagogical relations, and to use these results in the work of teacher education and teacher development.

These theoretical premises aim to show how pedagogical practices can be rendered into pedagogical knowledge with the aid of human agency. They highlight the importance of taking care the multiple contexts within which teachers and students are engaged. Also, they underline the evidence how pedagogical knowledge develops through practical activities and communicative interchange.

The concept of discipline

Generally, the notions of 'discipline' include both discipline as a body of knowledge and discipline as a means of control (Marshall, 1989, p. 109). Semantically, 'discipline' means "the order maintained and observed among pupils, or other persons under control or command" (Oxford English Dictionary, 2003). It is "a system or method for the

maintenance of order; a system of rules for conduct" (*ibid.*). It presupposes the training of students to proper action by instructing and exercising them. Thus, it is a question of mental and moral training. Within this interpretation, the teacher can be seen – and the teacher was traditionally seen - as "a discipline-master, a master in a school employed not to teach, but to keep order among the pupils" (*ibid.*)

Pedagogically, discipline relates to the school's function to socialize its members. Students – but also teachers - are subjected to the school's institutional influences, which are codified in many explicit and implicit rules and regulations. Student behavior that deviates from school expectations tends to be interpreted as problematic and/or indiscipline. Behavior is viewed as desirable or avoidable within the framework of the school rules, in comparison with and in accordance to established norms (Koutseliani, 2002, p. 354). For example, these norms include the following of 'school standards:' few noise in the classroom, consistency, respect for the teacher, and accepted forms of communication in the class: raising the hand, respecting other student's right to talk etc. In this way, the school institution functions as provider of social skills and moral knowledge. They are mainly learned as socially generated patterns of thinking and acting, and they also define the issues of discipline and classroom management. As socially constituted, students usually learn to internalize them without being forced to do so. Accordingly, teachers are authorized by their 'professional code:' the using of power regulation in classrooms, grouping of homogenous student behavior, and employing disciplinary systems of rewards and punishments (Koutselini, 2002).

In practice, the term 'discipline' means "the required action by a teacher or school official toward a student (or group of students) after his or her (or their) behavior disrupts the ongoing educational activity or breaks a pre-established rule or law created by the teacher, the school administration, or general society" (Wolfgang *et al.*, 1999, p. 3). It has two main goals: i) to ensure the safety of students and staff, and ii) to create an environment that can contribute to purposeful learning. School discipline seeks to encourage responsible student behavior and to provide all students with satisfying school experience. Roughly, it is business of enforcing classroom rules that facilitate classroom management and student learning, and minimizing disruption. But, simultaneously, it is actions and attitudes that are expected to produce a certain character and/or pattern of desired student behavior.

Discipline techniques in a power continuum

There are many discipline and classroom management approaches and systems available for teachers. Advice to teachers ranges from clear expectations with rewards and punishments (cf. Canter & Canter, 1992) to engaging students in the classroom management process (cf. Kohn, 1993, 1996). In practice, apparently a small minority of teachers uses those techniques in their pure form. Rather, most teachers eclectically incorporate a few techniques into the basic discipline system they have always used. They make them personally fit (Wolfgang, 2001).

Within discipline approaches, there is no single model of 'the best technique available' because of the differences among teachers, students and school contexts. Teachers know – explicitly and/or implicitly – that no technique or recipe can work successfully for all students at all times. Nor will the same technique always succeed for the same student as s/he may have different reasons for her/his behavior or s/he may exhibit different kind of misbehavior. Actually, most teachers do not use the same techniques with all students. Some students need only to be looked at in order to stop their misbehavior. With others, more confrontation may be needed, together with some discussion of how they can get back to their tasks.

In classrooms, teachers are rarely "discipline purists:" they tend to use many techniques, but with their own "spin" on those techniques (Wolfgang *et al*, 1999, p. 3). However, they may have a certain tendency to favor some approaches at the expense of others. Thus, teachers' management strategies are linked with the professional issues of power and control. Pedagogical situations usually permit teachers to use their abilities to decide how much power is needed for a particular student under each particular situation. Based on their past experiences with their students and an intimate knowledge of them, teachers make their decisions as to how much power and which techniques would be the most effective with the particular students.

Thus, teachers' actions should be interpreted according to some sort of power continuum (Wolfgang *et al*. 1999; Wolfgang, 2001), which allows us to explain those actions and their intended consequences. For example, students requiring strong intervention should face the teacher's physical intervention. However, gradually, the teacher would teach or lead the students to respond by using techniques of less and less power. As a result, the students learn gradually to control themselves and only 'light' techniques are needed, or none at all. This is because the teacher's professional task is to implement a system of classroom management and discipline that will ultimately help students become self-disciplined. Therefore, the ability to escalate and de-escalate the power of their actions is an integral part of the teaching profession. With this power regulation in mind, it is suggested that a minimum intrusion is first applied. If this fails

to be effective, a move to increased power or interference in discipline problems becomes appropriate.

The teacher's actions can be interpreted along a continuum of degrees of power and control over the student behavior. This investigation presents a power continuum as a construct and a presentation related to degrees of teacher professionalism, power issues, practical discipline techniques, and their intended consequences. The teacher's power continuum is dependent of the respective student behavior: the kind of a student role a teacher's actions authorize; the degrees of student autonomy a teacher's actions permit; the response they receive; and their interpreted effects on the student side.

Important, as the teacher increases the power aspects of her/his actions, the students' room to move simultaneously decreases. Therefore, the balancing of power regulations becomes a central task in discipline and classroom management problems. If the teacher sees the rules and regulations as the sole keeper of the discipline then the rules easily become the oppressor of her/his reflective mind. Thus, classroom management easily declines into a formal bureaucratic procedure, a kind of technical control that is run for the sake of the system irrespective of the interests of the students concerned (Doll, 1993). In such a situation, the pedagogical principles of learning in a caring and personalized environment become easily ignored at the expense of students – and teachers' – reflective development.

One of the main issues in the discipline debate has been a failure to identify conceptual bases for appropriate pedagogical performances (cf. Burnett & Meacham, 2002). The problem has been that practical tasks and associated behaviors have often become the performance criteria rather than underlying constructs and ideas. Also, the conceptual bases have neglected some important dimensions such as caring and moral dimensions between teachers and students (Tirri & Husu, 2002). Such neglect has often led to one-sided standardized techniques of discipline being applied over a wide rage of students – or led to a situation where there is no evaluation at all. Consequently, there is a need to give further consideration to discipline and classroom management problems as perceived relationally by teachers and students.

DATA AND METHODS

Participants and setting

Within discipline and classroom management problems, the focus on both teachers and students is valuable. In very respect, teachers are responsible for pedagogical actions taken place in classrooms (Kansanen *et al.*, 2000). Yet, it is also important to examine the student perspective as students are the impetus for teachers' decisions and actions.

Conceptually, but also practically, this is because *teaching* is the activity of *teachers* and *studying* is the activity of *students*. By using the concepts of teaching and studying the instructional process could be understood as active on behalf of both sides. Students can provide valuable insights into why they act appropriately or fail to so (cf. Supaporn, 2000). Also, students are aware of class management dynamics and the student views do not always correspond with those of teachers (cf. Cothran & Ennis, 1977; Cothran *et al.*, 2003). Students and teachers do not always assign the same meanings to the same events. Students actively interpret and influence the learning environment of the classroom. Actually, it is students' actions that trigger the teacher's behaviour: these two active poles are nearly inseparable. Students are active class members and their perceptions and reactions to the teachers' actions – not the teachers' actions alone – determine the pedagogical situations of the classroom. With better understanding of the students' views, teachers can provide greater insights into their class contexts.

The data reported here are drawn from a preliminary study of teachers' approaches and techniques of discipline and classroom management problems. During their teaching practicum, the student teachers collected 36 case studies of pedagogical dilemmas and their solving strategies among their supervised teachers. All the 36 teachers taught at the primary level (grades 1-6). The teachers were chosen from a body of teachers that had supervised student teachers in their classrooms. The selective procedure made it possible to obtain teachers with various backgrounds and pedagogical methods. Teachers themselves reported to be 'common,' 'traditional,' 'progressive,' 'favoring alternative pedagogical approaches,' and so on. One fifth of the interviewees were male (7/36). The specific contexts of the schools varied. They ranged in size from 130 to 450 students and in location, as students attended inner city and sub-urban public school settings. Student demographics at the schools were quite homogenous with approximately 7 % of other heritage than Finns. The socioeconomic status of the students was not available but the schools represented a range of neighborhoods with varying socioeconomic status. Seven of the schools could be classified as lower socioeconomic neighborhoods while the remaining schools represented middle class (21 schools) or upper middle class communities (8 schools).

Data collection and analysis

During their stay in the classrooms, student teachers interviewed their supervising teachers and observed their teaching both generally and in case-specific situations of discipline and classroom management problems. An interview guide (Wolfgang, 2001) structured the conversations which approximately lasted from 30 to 40 minutes. The interview topics were about to give insights about how teachers try to create and

maintain an orderly and caring classroom discipline for their students. Topics included descriptions of teacher/student behavior, cases in which students misbehaved, and the perceived effectiveness of the management strategies the teachers used. Student teachers made long notes of the interviews.

Based on this these written reports and classroom observations, student teachers constructed performing portraits to describe their supervising teachers. Ranged from 2-5 pages, these written reports explained and analyzed the teachers' personal philosophies of their pedagogical practices and the discipline techniques they preferred. In order to validate the portraits, the reports were given back to teachers for their comments.

In addition, student teachers observed the teachers' classroom management strategies and their discipline techniques in relation to their reported pedagogical approaches. These general observations focused on the two-day period as the 'daily grid' of the classroom management was taken into closer consideration. Specifically, they were encouraged to choose one particular situation in which the teacher used her/his discipline and classroom management techniques. Instead of serious student misconduct involving violent and criminal behavior, they were advised to choose less dramatic problems that still negatively affected the learning environment of the classroom. Student teachers observed the situation and analyzed it in their written case report. Also, the teachers were asked to tell about the case in detail, with all of the important context factors from their side.

The performing portraits and the case reports were analyzed using constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and analytic induction methods (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993) to identify and extract common interpretative themes. Each teacher education student and the author reviewed the performing portrait separately and then they together discussed about its coding along the teacher-student power continuum. The interpretation was then discussed, reviewed, and compared to the data. Frequently, the process included conversations about the authenticity and the strength of the various interpretations made. Several re- readings of the data took place which, in turn, led to collapse or consolidate some interpretations resulted in the themes presented in this paper.

It is believed that the methods used in this study provide a vehicle to determine how the background principles and actions of classroom management come up in concrete situations. As Strike argues (1993, p. 112), the case reports can provide instructional forums to practice pedagogical and moral reasoning and dialogue. According to him, the task is not so much to acquire 'the right techniques' or 'the favorable attitudes' as it is to allow the pedagogical discussion to become objects of conscious reflection. Consequently, the process also enhances the constant

sophistication of the employment of interpretative findings. In such learning, the basic purpose is not so much to discover "moral truth", as it is to uncover the web of educational decisions and actions in particular cases.

RESULTS

This paper makes two claims. First, teachers' basic beliefs of discipline and classroom management are presented. The development of an interpretative account on practical issues starts from this perspective. It gives us an opportunity to identify some important systems of schooling and their accompanying claims. Also, it provides a chance to examine the underlying assumptions why something is regarded as right or wrong. Second, discipline problems can also be viewed from a principle-based perspective. The approach judges educational decisions according to "implicit and explicit rules and duties owed" (Walker, 1998, p. 298). Within this perspective, the concern is not the actions, which are seen, but rather with their inner principles, which are not seen. It relies on abstract, general and principled accounts of appropriate guidelines of how to act in classroom management situations. The two claims are presented and argued with the aid of teacher-student power-continuum (cf. Wolfgang *et al.*, 1999).

Basic beliefs of discipline and teaching

The reflection of pedagogical aims and ideals is often eschewed by stating that they deal with aspirations rather than realities. However, pedagogical ideals make a major contribution to the formation of the teacher's self-identity (De Ruyter & Conroy, 2002). It does this by clarifying what the kind of person the individual teacher wishes to be, and by asking of how the teacher strives to achieve her/his ideals. In many cases, the ideals are actually doing the job: they are implicitly "embedded in unexamined social practices, vocabularies and perspectives" (Carr & Hartnett, 1996, p. 130). Therefore, the pragmatism to which teachers are often heavily committed is ultimately dependent on some attachment to the notion of some ideal state.

In this study, the interpreted degrees of personal and professional maturity among teachers vary. The following analysis describes and categorizes the teachers' expressed teaching-related beliefs of discipline and classroom management. Three broad categories in teachers' basic beliefs of classroom discipline emerged: the first category labeled teachers as pre-reflective and intuitive; the second type considered teachers as professionally reflective and confident; and the third category focused on teachers who could raise ethical and moral issues regarding their practices. When the teachers were looked at along a line of their professional and personal qualities, a three-dimensional

continuum was used as a tool and as a visual display. Figure 1 presents the categories within the continuum:

Minimum professional role influence		**Maximum professional role influence**
PRE-REFLECTIVE, INTUITIVE Self-oriented	**REFLECTIVE, CONFIDENT** Task-oriented: curriculum & instruction	**RELATIONAL, MORAL** End-oriented: causes of student behaviour
Maximum personal influence		Minimum personal influence

Figure 1. Teachers' basic beliefs of discipline and classroom management.

The power continuum between the teachers' professional role and their personal characteristics is central within these categories of the discipline continuum. At the professional end of the continuum, the teachers' role orientation forms the core of their basic beliefs. At the other end, the teachers' (over-)personalized agenda is at the front. This rivalry between personalistic pedagogy (Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982) and role-oriented professional standards (Buchmann, 1993) is of vital importance here. Next, descriptions of the three interpretative categories consisting basic beliefs of teaching and classroom discipline are provided:

- *Pre-reflective, intuitive teacher* is often just entered into profession and s/he has only minimal experience. However, s/he can also be an experienced teacher in her/his mid-career. Her/his immediate goal is to get smoothly through the day without major disruption to classroom activities. When real discipline disruptions occur these teachers try to avoid their interference with the problem situations: they just 'don't see the problem.' And if they do, they do not feel fit with the needed discipline techniques or with their being in a teacher role of a discipline-keeper. Metaphorically, in classrooms, they are like 'strangers in a foreign land.' These teachers draw both explicitly and implicitly on their personal experiences, disciplining others as they were themselves disciplined by their parents, teachers, or other significant adults. In problem situations, they respond (or avoid) quite intuitively and without much thinking or analyzing the situations and their positions in them as teachers. They have quite a limited

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

repertoire of discipline and management techniques that work for some or even most students, but not all. Sometimes their actions can be successful and effective, while at other times they do not work at all. In order to maintain control, the teachers takes some action that may not be powerful enough. Consequently, some students defy their authority and this defiance tends to spread to other students in the class. In order to maintain their authority, the teacher feels forced to use the same methods and techniques – but this time in a harsher form. The actions frighten some students, but some push the teacher to practice even stronger actions. These teachers do not want to be 'classroom officers' which they easily end up to be. This, in turn, grows their dislike towards teaching and students. In our data, 16 % of teachers (N=6/36) belonged to this end of the discipline continuum.

- *Reflective and confident teachers* usually have longer teaching experience. They have received – and also accepted – feedback from their students, parents, and fellow teachers. According to this response, these teachers are usually well liked, respected, and viewed as effective and good teachers, also in discipline matters. In their professional self, they feel the same: their solid feeling of success gives them confidence. They have their own repertoire of discipline techniques which enable them to have smooth-working and well-disciplined classrooms. Their skill as a teacher is their ability to be reflective about their discipline actions. They know explicitly that their doings are effective with most of their students. Also, they are capable to use more discipline techniques on a continuum of escalating and de-escalating their power in the classrooms. These teachers may not like seeing themselves as using more controlling and powerful techniques, but they realize that sometimes this level of teacher interference is needed for some students. Gradually, they are able to 'step back' and retreat to methods more congruent with their own teacher style and personality. However, these teachers often have difficulties with some students in their classroom. Even if they are professionally confident they find some students very difficult to handle and resent the amount of time and energy these students require. The teachers feel that the other students in the classroom are being put aside due to the time and effort these difficult students require. Other professionals such as specialized teachers, school psychologists and classroom assistants are requested to take responsibility of these students. In our data, 42 % of teachers (N=15/36) were interpreted within this category of professional reflection and confidence.
- *Teachers' relational and moral qualities* characterize the third category of basic beliefs. These teachers are also confident in their own teaching and discipline

abilities. They actively seek help of colleagues and other professionals to assist them with their problem students. However, these teachers are more willing to co-operate with the supporting team, creating together agreed-upon strategies, and implementing individualized discipline plans. Important, they also find time during the day to carry out such interventions. Those actions can be successful to various degree. Through their own reasoning, these teachers can raise ethical issues and value their own actions as what is regarded best for their students. The teachers are able to ask questions of what life is really like for students in this particular school, and what kind of rules and regulations are for the betterment of student discipline. And for whom is the discipline for – for the sake of students or for the convenience of the teachers. Their focus on relationships is distinct from the teachers of the previous categories. They seek after relationships, which enable them to learn about their students and themselves as teachers. Some of them provide informal leadership in their school by being a sort of mentor for other - especially young - teachers. In our data, 42 % (N=15/36) of the teachers were characterized (at least to some extent) by these relational and moral qualities in their discipline issues.

It is clear that there are tensions between these three categories of the teacher behavior continuum. However, attention to the competing issues of personalistic and professional role orientations provides the opportunity to present a more balanced and expansive view of teacher competence and quality in discipline issues. Next, the question guiding our analysis was: "What were the guiding principles that set the standards for the teachers' practical actions in classroom management problems?"

Standards of actions guides in classroom discipline

In looking for evidence of different discipline strategies, we were not interested primarily in statements or observations having an outward form of a discipline strategy. Rather, our interest was in the way the teachers' statements and actions operated in structuring their pedagogical knowledge of classroom management problems. The perspective requires teachers to adopt – either explicitly or implicitly – a certain course of action that provides a general guide to action, a certain authority in teachers' decision-making in discipline problems. As action guides, these principles indicate the moral rights and obligations that are at stake in a dilemma. They can clarify and justify the solutions to pedagogical problems because they "provide the standards by which ethical actions and decisions are made" (Nash, 1996, p. 111).

Frequently, classroom incidents must be dealt with in a matter of minutes or even seconds as the teacher gets involved in the situation, modifying her/his approach as s/he receives responses from the students. In the following analysis, the interpreted degrees of the teacher's power stance are related to students' autonomy in discipline issues. This study uses three approaches (Wolfgang *et al.*, 1999) to present and discuss teachers' principled approaches of classroom discipline. First, we talk about the most powerful intervention attitude and technique, rules and consequence approach. It favors clearly stated rules for student behavior to get the positive behavior sought by the teacher. The second 'face', confronting-contracting, maintains an adult and professional relationship with students by requesting the student to stop and change. The decision to change remains in the students' hands. The last approach is the least intrusive of the three stances. Relationship-listening 'face' emphasizes that the teacher's task is to establish a non-judgmental relationship with her/his students. Only the student has the capability to change her/his misbehavior, the teacher's tasks is to provide the students a way to more purposeful behavior. Figure 2. presents the categories within the continuum:

Minimum student autonomy		**Maximum student autonomy**
RULES & CONSEQUENCES Commanding, acting & modelling	**CONFRONTING – CONTRACTING** Questioning	**RELATIONSHIP – LISTENING** Looking, naming
Maximum teacher control		Minimum teacher control

Figure 2. Teachers' principled action guides in the discipline issues.

The power continuum between the maximum teacher control and maximum student autonomy is central within these categories of the discipline continuum. At the teacher end of the continuum, the teachers' task is to confront the misbehavior and stop an action that is occurring. As the student autonomy is emphasized, the teacher's explicit agenda is at the back. The continuous tension between these two poles is characteristic to this continuum.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Before going into the basic approaches of classroom management, a clarification of the discipline issues is provided. Based on our teacher interviews and classroom observations, we estimate that approximately three thirds (75 %) of all discipline problems involve some kind off-task behavior of students talking (too loud) to others when they should be working attentively. The category also including the students' rude and inappropriate language use. The second most common form of disturbance was off or out seat behaviors (approximately 20 %) as the students left their seats or working posts without any acceptable reason and/or teacher permission. They were followed by such misbehaviors like ignoring teaching and showing displeasure publicly in classroom, playing with unauthorized objects during the lesson, and note passing. However, serious discipline problems (physical aggression, destruction of property) were rare occurrences in our data. Therefore, what is important is to look at (and also theorize) more carefully these small actions that to eat up time for classroom learning and consume teacher energies. Next, descriptions of the three interpretative categories consisting standards of actions guides in classroom discipline are provided:

- *The rules and consequences* approach is the teacher's stance towards misconduct that supports the following kind of message: 'I am the teacher here and this is my classroom, I have the perfect right to get my justified needs as a teacher met." They see that the misbehaving students are taking away their right to teach and other students' right to learn. Thus, the teacher must assert control. Right from the start, these teachers determine the rules and behavior in the classroom and make them clear to their students. They are also sensitive to keep those rules and regulations. When a student breaks the rule, a determined action is taken by the teacher to state clearly the expected behavior and to demand compliance from the student. If the student doesn't stop her/his misbehavior and/or disturbance, the teacher is prepared to take actions to stop or to decrease misbehavior through her/his actions. These teachers are committed to tell their wants to their students. Also, they are prepared (and sometimes willing) to reinforce their words with appropriate actions. They respond in a manner that maximizes their capacity to get their aims met - frequently in a professionally competent way. This type of limit-setting method is quite powerful teacher intervention technique. In our data, 42 % (N=15/36) of the teachers were characterized by this the rules and consequences stance.
- *The confronting-contracting* approach reflects the attitude that the teacher is the adult, and knows what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior. When a student is misbehaving, the teacher clearly confronts that student in order to make her/him clear that the kind of behavior will not be permitted to continue. Even if

he the teacher is active in his confrontation, the approach is demanding of the student. This is because the goal of the confronting-contracting is to have the student to reflect on her/his behavior and its negative effects. As the teacher confronts the student, the teacher wants the student to speak out how s/he has come up to live with the rules and classroom realities. These teachers want their students to evaluate their own behavior, to use their rational capacities to control their actions. The teacher cannot solve the problem for the student. Rather, the teacher's task is the strengthening of the student's capacities: the student is permit control to choose how s/he will change her/his behavior. The teacher is there to help the student gain the student's social skills. In this preliminary study, 22 % of teachers (N=8/36) were interpreted within this continuum category of confronting-contracting.

- *The relationship-listening* approach calls for minimum outward teacher intervention. The stance relies on student autonomy as the teacher tries to encourage the students in the direction of appropriate behavior. The relationship-listening position views the misbehaving student as a person who has some internal mental tension that causes her/his unacceptable behavior. Here, the role of the teacher is not view this misbehavior as a personal affront, but rather as a student's unauthorized attempt to communicate and signal her/his present unhappy mental state. What s student needs is a non-judgmental and supportive response from the teacher. Punishing the student by relying on the classroom rules, for example, would simply increase her/his inner tension and make the situation even worse. The goal of the relationship-listening approach is to take supportive and empathetic teacher actions and reactions that maintain the positive relationship with the student. It is believed that this, in turn, would help the student to become more rational and self-directed. The student is seen as a capable and developing person who can also solve her/his problems. Under the teacher's caring and nonjudgmental guidance, the student can become a more empowered person. If the teacher takes those actions, the student may become dependant and this may weaken her/his future development. Within this stance, the teacher's professional but also personal role modeling is of vital importance: the virtues of teaching are 'at work' here. In our data, 36 % (N=13/36) of the teachers were characterized by these relational qualities in their discipline issues.

DISCUSSION

For teachers, an important task is for them to learn to analyze pedagogical issues from different points of view in a way that allows them to become objects of conscious reflection. As this study shows, teachers' dialogical understanding is of vital importance. Analyzing and discussing pedagogical issues can help teachers to identify and articulate their knowing more clearly. The process also may help them to see the worth of social skills required for pedagogical judgments. Teachers may learn to listen more meaningfully, to acquire a sharper sense of moral diversity, and to respect differences of opinion. It may promote the understanding that schools are characterized by personal moral encounters.

As our analysis showed, teachers' actions were heavily informed by their professional obligations. Moreover, teachers' own moral character came to the fore here-for example, in the teacher's very willingness, in the first place, to accept the professional obligations in question. To be sure, teachers should be virtuous and caring persons. However, we should also consider what kinds of teachers are needed in schools, and what can be done during formal teacher education to help them become ethical individuals.

Pedagogical knowledge and judgment cannot be learned sufficiently during formal teacher preparation. It is the product of years, not credit hours. Teacher education programs should acknowledge that actual work in school settings persistently informs teachers' practice. According to these results, a considerable variability in the quality and capability of teachers' pedagogical knowing must be expected. Therefore, rather than blame teachers themselves or teacher educators for incomplete attention to the issue, policy considerations should attend to teachers' professional learning in their practical school settings. Special attention must be accorded to create social conditions in schools that permit appropriate conditions for the teachers' continuous development in their work.

In classrooms and staffrooms, such a collective exchange of meanings presupposes that many different types of meanings become visible. It presupposes a willingness and means to create conditions for open dialogue. Among the attributes of this situation is the need to move away from a rule-governed understanding of practice and open up the number of meanings and descriptions of practice. Finally, collective reflection should accept difference and divergence. It should not regard them as potentially debilitating. On the contrary, teachers should learn to "live with doubt." Then, the key is not unanimous agreement, but discourse and the testing of plural meanings.

References

Alberto, P. A. & Troutman, A. C. (1990). *Applied behaviour analysis for teachers, 3rd ed.* New York: Merrill-Macmillan.

Borg, M. & Riding, R. J. (1991). Towards a model for the determinants of occupational stress among schoolteachers. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, VI*, 255-373.

Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: a critical study of learning to teach.* New York: State Univeesity of New York Press.

Buchmann, M. (1993). Dilemmas and virtues in research communication. In M. Buchmann & R. E. Floden (Eds.), *Detachment and concern: conversations in the philosophy of teaching and teacher education* (pp. 112-127). London: Cassell.

Burnett, P. C. & Meacham, D. (2002). Measuring the quality of teaching in elementary school classrooms. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 30*(2),141-153.

Canter, L. Canter, M. (1992). *Assertive discipline: a take charge approach for today's educator.* Seal Beach, CA: Canter and Associates.

Carr, W. & Hartnett, A. (1996). *Education and the struggle for democracy. The politics of educational ideals.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Conway, P. E. & Clark, C. M. (2003). The journey inward and outward: a re-examination of Fuller's concerns-based model of teacher development. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(5), 465-482.

Cothran, D. J. & Ennis, C. D. (1997). Students' and teachers' perceptions of conflict and power. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(5), 541-553.

Cothran, D. J., Hodges Kulinna, P.,Garrahy, D. A. (2003). "This is kind of giving a secret away …": students' perspectives on effective class management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(4), 453-444.

Cotton, K. (1990). *Educational time factors. Close up #8.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

De Ruyter, D. & Conroy, J. (2002). The formation of identity: the importance of ideals. *Oxford Review of Education, 28*, 509-522.

Doll, W. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Dunne, J. (1993). *Back to the rough ground: Practical judgement and the lure of technique.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Freeman, D. (1996). "To take them at their word": language data in the study of teachers' knowledge. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(4), 732-761.

Fuller, F. F. & Brown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education* (74th Yearbook of the national Society of Education, pp. 25-52). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gallego, M. A., Hollingsworth, S., & Whitenack, D. A. (2001). Relational knowing in the reform of educational cultures. *Teachers College Press, 103*(2), 240-266.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. New York: Macmillan.

Husu, J. & Tirri, K. (2001). Teachers' ethical choices in socio-moral settings. *Journal of Moral Education, 30*(4), 361-365.

Husu, J. & Tirri, K. (2003). A case study approach to study one teacher's moral reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(3), 345-357.

Husu, J. (2001). Teachers' at cross-purposes: a case-report approach to study of ethical dilemmas in teaching. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision, 17*(1), 67-89.

Husu, J. (2002a). *Representing the practice of teachers' pedagogical knowing*. Turku, FIN: Finnish Educational Research Association.

Husu, J. (2002b). Negotiating ethics as relational knowing: a pedagogical space between "right" and "wrong". *ERIC Resources in Education*, ED 466 706.

Husu, J. (2003). Constructing ethical representations from the teachers' pedagogical practice: a case of prolonged refelection. *Interchange, 34*(1), 1-21.

Jones, F. (1987). *Positive discipline*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jones, F. (2000). *Tools for teaching: discipline, instruction, and motivation*. Santa Cruz, CA: Fredric H. Hones & Associates, Inc.

Kansanen, P., Tirri, K., Meri, M., Krokfors, L., Husu, J., & Jyrhämä, R. (2000). *Teachers' pedagogical thinking: theoretical landscapes, practical challenges*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by rewards: the trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's praise, and other bribes*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Kohn, A. (1996). *Beyond discipline: from compliance to community*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Koutselini, M. (2002). The problem of discipline in light of modern post-modern discourse. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 10*(3), 353-365.

LeCompte, M. D. & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2d ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Marshall, J. (1999). Foucault and education. *Australian Journal of Education, 33*(2), 99-113.

McCormack, A. (1997). Classroom management problems, strategies, and influences in physical education. *European Physical Review, 3*(2), 102-115.

Miller Marsh, M. (2002). Examining the discourses that shape our teacher identities. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32*(4), 453-469.

Nash, R. (1996). *"Real world" ethics. Frameworks for educators and human service professionals*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Oxford English dictionary (2003). Oxford University Press: OED online, http://dictionary.oed.com

Reid, W. (1999). *Curriculum as institution and practice: essays in deliberative tradition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roth, W. M., Lawless, D. V., & Masciotra, D. (2001). *Spielraum* and teaching. *Curriculum Inquiry, 31*(2), 183-207.

Schwab, J. (1969). The practical: a language for curriculum. *School Review, 78*(1), 1-23.

Schwab, J. J. (1971). The practical: arts of eclectic. *School Review, 79*(4), 493-542.

Sherman, N. (1989). *The fabric of character: Aristotle's theory of virtue*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sockett, H. (1993). *The moral base for teacher professionalism*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Strike, K.A. (1993). Teaching ethical reasoning using cases. In K. A. Strike & P. L. Ternasky (Eds.), *Ethics for professionals in education: perspectives for preparation and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Supaporn, S. (2000). High school students' perspectives about misbehaviour. *Physical Educator, 57*, 124-135.

van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry, 6*(3), 205-228.

Waks, L. J. (2000) Essay review: Reid's theory of curriculum as institutionalized practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 32*(4), 589-598.

Walker, K. (1998). Jurisprudential and ethical perspectives on "the best interests of children". *Interchange, 29*, 287-308.

Wolfgang, C. H. (2001). *Solving discipline and classroom management problems: methods and models for today's teachers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wolfgang, C. H., Bennet, B. J., & Irwin, J. L. (1999). *Strategies for teaching self-discipline in the middle grades*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action: a strategy for research and analysis*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K. & Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education:an analysis of two approaches to the development of curriculum for field-based experience. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 8*(2), 95-117.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM035323

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: WHAT A DIFFERENCE A DISCIPLINE APPROACH MAKES? CONSTRUCTING PERFORMING QUALITY IN TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONS

Author(s): HUSU, JUKKA

Corporate Source: DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION/UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Publication Date: 08/30/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ☒ Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.	Level 2A ☐ Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Level 2B ☐ Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Jukka Husu	Printed Name/Position/Title: JUKKA HUSU/RESEARCH FELLOW/PH. D.
Organization/Address: DEPT. OF TEACHER EDUCATION SILTAVUOREENPENGER 20 O P.O. BOX 9 00014 UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI FINLAND	Telephone: +358-9-191 29 557 FAX: +358-9-191 29 611 E-Mail Address: JUKKA.HUSU@HELSINKI.FI Date: 09/04/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
University of Maryland, College Park
1129 Shriver Lab
College Park, MD 20742